

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10-11, 13-17, 18 and 20-21 have been amended and claim 3 has been cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 6, 11, 16 and 21 are objected because of various informalities. In particular, the Office suggests changing “at least one of a” to “at least one of the following.” Office Action, p. 2. In response, Applicants have amended claims 6, 11, 16 and 21 to comply with the Office’s request. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 6, 11, 16 and 21 are objected to because of a typographical error. In response, Applicants have amended the claims to correct the error. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd ¶, as allegedly failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. In response, Applicants have amended the claims to provide a more generic description of the goods/services identified by the trademark LOTUS NOTES. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are definite and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office asserts

10/730,247 Page 9 of 12

that the limitation “a computerized system” can be software per se. In response, Applicants have amended claims 13-17 to now recite, *inter alia*, “...computer implemented system.”

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 13-17 are not software per se and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Netscan (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021001103129/netscan.research.microsoft.com/Static/Default.asp>), hereinafter “Netscan.” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following remarks.

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, including “recommending the collaborative space to a potential user based on desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user, wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space.” (See claim 1 and as similarly recited by claims 8, 13 and 18). Interpreting Netscan only for the purposes of this response, Applicants submit that Netscan allows a potential user to provide only two metrics, i.e. a group name and a search date. Office Action, p. 4. When a user operating the system in Netscan inputs group name “windowsxp” corresponding to the first available metric, he/she is providing a metric that is related to Windows XP content. Searching by group name will necessarily provide the user with newsgroups based on the content of information, i.e. Windows XP. Furthermore, the second available metric (date) fails to measure any sort of interactivity *between* users. Instead, the date metric simply displays newsgroups available on the entered day. Accordingly, neither metric option in Netscan allows the user to

10/730,247 Page 10 of 12

provide at least one desired interactive metric that measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space.

In contrast to Netscan, the present invention recites, *inter alia*, "...wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space." Claim 1. The present invention allows the potential user to designate the type of collaborative space for which he/she is looking by allowing at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user to measure interactivity between users unrelated to the content/topic of the collaborative space. This allows the user to search for a collaborative space based on a specific reason (e.g., to obtain a quick answer to a posting). Netscan, however, only allows a user to provide metrics based on the underlying group name/content and the date. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Since similar amendments have been made to independent claims 8, 13 and 18, withdrawal of the rejection of those claims is also requested.

With respect to all of the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Darrell. Pogue/

Darrell L. Pogue

Reg. No.: 57,878

Date: December 20, 2006

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)